



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

UN-HOMERIC ELEMENTS IN THE MEDIEVAL  
STORY OF TROY.

THE purpose of the present paper is to discuss the origin and leading manifestations of a spirit of antagonism to Homer that plays a conspicuous part in medieval representations of the Trojan War. While this theme permits, for the most part, only of a descriptive and empirical treatment, an attempt will nevertheless be made, wherever possible, to indicate the conditions under which this anti-Homeric spirit originated and the causes that may have given it birth.

To those who read the *Troilus and Cressida* of Chaucer and Shakespeare for the first time it is a matter of no little surprise to discover that the story of Troy as there presented differs in many essential respects from that with which they are familiar in Homer. It is not alone that the Greeks are pictured by the English poets in a distinctly ridiculous light, that the most conspicuous Trojans are those with whom they are least acquainted in Homer, but the entire setting and atmosphere of the English poems differs so radically from that of the *Iliad* that, were it not for the occasional correspondence of a name or situation, they would with difficulty recognize the themes of the two as identical. In Chaucer and still more in Shakespeare the Greeks and Trojans no longer wear the dignified garb of antiquity but are outlandishly tricked out in the parti-colored patch work of clown, jester, and buffoon. Riot, ribaldry, and vituperation replace the stately repose of the *Iliad*. Classical propriety and decorum have given place to a setting primarily romantic and phantasmagoric, to manners essentially Gothic and grotesque.

The question accordingly arises, how is this complete trans-

formation of the antique in Chaucer and Shakespeare to be accounted for? Is the altered English representation due to a deliberate desire on the part of the English poets to accommodate the Homeric representation to some aesthetic or moral purpose of their own, such as the wish to oppose the essentially sensuous and immoral standards of antiquity to the more exalted ethics of Christian Europe,<sup>1</sup> or is it to be ascribed to a preëxisting, traditional conception of the Trojan War, which Chaucer and Shakespeare felt bound to respect and obey?

In answer to this question it can easily be shown that the latter alternative is the correct one, and that the English poets, so far from having any ulterior moral or artistic purpose to serve, based their poems throughout upon the traditional conception of the Trojan War as found in the works of their medieval predecessors and as still current in their own day. Proof that such was the case is to be found in the fact that all the structural elements appearing in Chaucer and all but a very few in Shakespeare<sup>2</sup> were already present in the Trojan histories of their medieval predecessors. Thus, to cite but one or two examples, Shakespeare's "dreadful sagittary" (V, 5, 14) first appears as the giant archer who in Benoît (*Roman de Troie*, ed. Joly, Paris, 1870, v. 12207) accompanies king Epistrophus to the Trojan War and in the same author (vv. 13235 ff.) occurs the earliest known representation of the relationship that exists between the Troilus and Cressida of Chaucer and of Shakespeare. Nor did Benoît, in his turn, invent the materials that enter into the substance of his *Roman de Troie* but derived the entire substance of that poem from earlier histories. Thus his men-

<sup>1</sup>The interpretation applied to Shakespeare by Ulrici, *Shakespeare's dramatische Kunst*, translated by Schmitz, London, 1890, II, 144-5.

<sup>2</sup>These few—of which the chief is the figure of Thersites—were in every case drawn from Chapman's *Iliad* (cf. R. A. Small, *The Stage-Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the so-called Poetasters*, Breslau, 1899, pp. 165 ff.).

tion of "India" (v. 3843) as the place where the judgment of Paris occurred is due to a mistranslation of the "in Ida silvia" of Dares Phrygius (*De Excidio Trojæ Historia*, ed. Meister, cap. VII) and his account (vv. 26485 ff.) of the dispute between Ajax and Ulysses for the possession of the Trojan Palladium is already present in Dictys Cretensis (*Ephemeris Belli Trojani*, ed. Meister, lib. V, cap. 14). In other words, the contents of the English poems may be traced, directly or indirectly, to the works of the following predecessors. Shakespeare had recourse for the materials of his *Troilus and Cressida* in part to Chaucer and in part to the third book of Caxton's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*; <sup>1</sup> Caxton and Chaucer go back, the one to *Le Recueil des Histories de Troye* of Raoul le Fevre, <sup>2</sup> and the other to the *Filistrato* of Boccaccio; <sup>3</sup> Boccaccio and Raoul revert, the latter to the *Historia Trojana* of Guido delle Colonne <sup>4</sup> and the former to *Le Roman de Troie* of Benoît de Ste.-More; <sup>5</sup> Guido to Benoît, <sup>6</sup> and Benoît, in his turn, derived the earlier portion of his *Roman* from Dares Phrygius and the latter portion from Dictys Cretensis. <sup>7</sup> It is accordingly to Dares and Dictys, as thus constituting the ultimate source of the medieval story of Troy, that recourse must be had for the earliest detailed exemplification of a representation so strangely sub-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Small, op. cit., pp. 154 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Oskar Sommer, Caxton's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, London, 1894, Introd. p. lxxxv.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wm. Michael Rossetti, *Chaucer's Troilus and Cryseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato*, Chaucer Society Publications, XLIV and LXV, 1873.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Sommer, op. cit., Introd. pp. cxxxi ff.

<sup>5</sup> Also, in a subsidiary degree, to Guido, as well. Cf. Karl Young, *The Relation of the Filostrato to the Roman de Troie and to the Historia Trojana*, a Harvard dissertation soon to appear in the Chaucer Society Publications.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Dunger, *Die Sage vom trojanischen Kriege*, Leipzig, 1869, p. 61.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Joly, *Benoît de Ste.-More et Le Roman de Troie*, Paris, 1870, Première Partie, pp. 146 ff.

versive of all those notions with which the name of Homer is customarily associated. But before proceeding to an examination of the specifically un-Homeric elements in Dares and Dictys, it will be well to recall very briefly the general characteristics of these two works.

The Trojan histories ascribed to Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius are both forgeries. Though perpetrated presumably in the Greek language and in the second century of our era, these forgeries survive only in Latin versions of the fourth and sixth centuries respectively.<sup>1</sup> Dictys, who claims to be a Cretan soldier who fought on the side of the Greeks, writes his *Ephemeris* in the interests of the Greeks; Dares, who purports to be a Phrygian soldier who fought on the side of the Trojans, has composed his "acta diurna"<sup>2</sup> in the interests of the Trojans. Each history is provided with a preface in which an attempt is made to account for the survival of such valuable relics of antiquity. Dictys' preface consists of two parts, a prologue and an epistle. The prologue was, in all probability, written by the author, the epistle added by the translator.<sup>3</sup> According to the prologue, the annals of the Cretan soldier Dictys, written in ten books,<sup>4</sup> in Phœnician characters upon linden

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed recapitulation of the arguments in favor of a Greek Dictys see my dissertation, *Dares and Dictys*, Baltimore, 1907, pp. 17 ff. Since the appearance of this dissertation and the completion of the present article, the discovery of a fragment of the Greek Dictys (published in *The Tebtunis Papyri*, ed. Grenfell, Hunt, and Goodspeed, Pt. II, pp. 9 ff., London, 1907) has confirmed my conclusion.

<sup>2</sup> The term which the author himself applies to his work: "ruerunt ex Argivis, sicut acta diurna indicant quae Dares descripsit" (XLIV).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Koerting, *Dares and Dictys*, Halle, 1874, pp. 48 ff.; Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*, pp. 118 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Although the prologue gives "six" as the number of books in which Dictys wrote his memoirs, there can be no doubt that ten was the correct number. For in the epistle the translator states that he has retained the last "five" books of his original intact, but has condensed the last "five" into one. The reading "six" in the prologue must therefore have been a late substitution, due, no doubt, to a confusion with the number of books in the Latin translation.

bark, were exposed by a Cretan earthquake in the thirteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Nero and transliterated into Greek script at the emperor's request. According to the epistle, which purports to be written by Lucius Septimius, a Roman, to his friend Quintus Aradius Rufinus, Septimius states that he has translated the *Ephemeris* into Latin, retaining the first five books of his original intact, but condensing the last five, which treat of the return of the Greeks, into one. Similarly Dares' preface, which likewise consists of a letter claiming to be written by Cornelius Nepos to Salustius Crispus, informs the reader that while at Athens Nepos discovered records of the Trojan War written by Dares the Phrygian, who fought on the side of the Trojans. These he has "translated into Latin in order that the reader might judge whether Dares, who actually took part in the Trojan War, or Homer, who was not born until long afterwards, possesses the better title to veracity." "For Homer," he adds, "was afterwards tried at Athens for representing the gods as fighting with men."

The ingenious pretensions thus set forth in the two histories meet no contradiction in the narratives that ensue. Both historians account in every case for their sources of information, eliminate all miraculous and supernatural agencies, and present such scrupulous attention to detail as would seem to befit the testimony of eye-witnesses.

By this resort to a species of literary imposture much in vogue at the time in which they wrote,<sup>1</sup> the authors of the memoirs of the pseudo-Dares and Dictys found no difficulty in convincing a credulous public that their spurious productions were genuine relics of antiquity. Both documents,

<sup>1</sup> The fiction of pre-Homeric authorship was employed not only by the pseudo-Dares and Dictys but also by the presumably contemporary authors of the memoirs of the equally fabulous Sysiphus of Cos, Corinnus the Ilian, Phidalius of Corinth, etc. (cf. p. 50).

though clearly derived from late and impure sources,<sup>1</sup> were accepted at their face value by subsequent generations, who readily acquiesced in a deception which they lacked the critical acumen to detect. Throughout the Middle Ages Homer became virtually set aside and the specious memoirs of Dares and Dictys substituted as more trustworthy records of the Trojan War. Both authors appear in innumerable translations and adaptations in the more common languages of Europe, Dares also in an Irish<sup>2</sup> version, and in an Icelandic.<sup>3</sup> Repeated allusions to Hector, Troilus, and Achilles in English lists of the popular romances of the day, such as those in the *Cursor Mundi* (*Early English Text Society*, LVII, vv. 1-6) and in David Lindsay's *Epistle to his Dreme* (*ibid.* XIX, vv. 34-41) indicate that the tale of Troy enjoyed no less favor than the three great rival tales of Arthur, Charlemagne, and Alexander. Nor did the Revival of Learning at once terminate the vogue of these popular idols. Notwithstanding the appearance of Chapman's *Iliad* in 1598 it was, as has been shown, the old tradition to which in 1603 Shakespeare gave final literary expression in his *Troilus and Cressida*, and to which in 1679 Dryden reverted in his *Troilus and Cressida: or, Truth found too Late*. Even professed students of antiquity were not wanting, such as Leo Allatius,<sup>4</sup> who in the same century still upheld the genuineness of these records. Thus for many centuries Europe lay at the mercy of a lie and it was not until the opening of the eighteenth century that pretensions so long maintained at last met thoroughgoing repudiation at the hands of Perizo-

<sup>1</sup> Cf., on the sources of Dares, Wagner, *Beiträge zu Dares Phrygius, Philologus* XXXVIII, 91 ff.; on the sources of Dictys, Dunger, *Dictys-Septimius*, Dresden, 1878, pp. 38 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Togail Troi*, ed. Stokes and Windisch, *Irische Texte*, II, Leipzig, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> *The Trójumanna Saga*, ed. J. Sigurðsson, *Annaler for nordisk Oldkyndighed*, Copenhagen, 1848.

<sup>4</sup> *De Patria Homeri* in Gronovius, *Thesaurus*, p. 1745.

nus, who, in a dissertation prefixed to the 1702 edition of the Delphin Classics, by proofs too definitive to permit further hesitation, removed for all time the last vestiges of this peculiar veneration.

It is not, however, with these more general features of the Dares and Dictys forgeries, nor yet with the story, remarkable and fascinating as that is, of their long-continued popularity in subsequent generations, that this present paper is primarily concerned, but rather with the evidence that these forgeries afford with regard to the origin and nature of those essentially romantic and un-Homeric elements which afterwards appear in Chaucer and Shakespeare. In order to effect this purpose it will be necessary to point out the more specific and noteworthy variations from Homer in these histories and to show in what way the variations in question reappear in the literature of subsequent generations.

The fundamental spirit of antagonism to Homer present in Dares and Dictys reveals itself in a number of different ways, now in the fiction of pre-Homeric composition, now in an attempt to rationalize Homeric myth and to substitute in its place piquant bits of realistic observation, again in the more or less complete transformation of Homeric legend, and still again in the presence of a strong partisan bias, in favor of the Greeks in Dictys and of the Trojans in Dares.

As regards, in the first place, the fiction of pre-Homeric authorship. Dares and Dictys claim that they were actual participants in the Trojan War and eye-witnesses of the events they relate, whereas Homer was not born until long afterwards. Thus Dares declares (XII, XLIV) that he fought on the side of the Trojans until the city was captured, that he mingled freely with the Greeks and Trojans both in times of war and truce, and that after the war he remained at Troy with the party of Antenor. In like manner Dictys asserts (Prol.; I, 13; VI, 2) that he went to the Trojan War in the company of the Cretan generals Idomeneus and Meriones, that after the fall of Troy he returned with these



generals to Crete, and that he there wrote, at their suggestion, a record of his personal experiences. In order to make his claims appear well grounded each author later takes pains to specify, with the utmost precision, the exact means by which he became informed of the events he relates. Dictys states (I, 13; VI, 3, 5, 10) that he learned the events prior to the war from the lips of Ulysses, the events of the war itself from personal experience, the events subsequent to the war in part from Menelaus, who, being on his return to Greece driven from home, sought refuge in Crete, in part from Ulysses, who was rescued from shipwreck and brought to Crete by sailors of Idomeneus, and in part from Neoptolemus, whose nuptials in Sparta the author attended in person. Similarly Dares (XII) became acquainted<sup>1</sup> with the personal appearance of the Trojans and of the Greeks who were present at Troy either on the field of battle or during times of truce, of the Greeks who were absent, from the reports of those present. All particulars which, in the nature of the case, could have fallen under the observation neither of Dares and Dictys nor of their informants are, for the most part, consistently excluded. Thus Dares, who remained in Troy after the fall of the city, omits, as beyond his means of knowledge, the story, which Dictys (VI) gives, of the return of the Greeks. Conversely, Dictys, who first went to Troy at the outbreak of hostilities, passes over in silence Dares' account (I-III) of the Argonautic Expedition and First Destruction of Troy by Hercules as events of which he, in his turn, possessed no direct means of information.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In marked contrast to Dictys, Dares always refers to himself in the third person. Cf. "Dares Phrygius, qui hanc historiam scripsit, ait . . . hos se vidisse, etc." (XII) with "eorum [sc. Idomenei et Merionis] ego secutus, etc." (*Eph.* I, 13).

<sup>2</sup> Neither Dares nor Dictys is strictly consistent in the suppression of particulars that could have fallen neither under his own observation nor that of his informants. Thus Dictys introduces the Rape of Helen

By thus representing themselves as prior to Homer in point of time Dares and Dictys succeeded in impressing upon the minds of their successors the belief that they were superior to Homer in point of veracity. Thus the twelfth-century Benoît de Ste.-More (op. cit. vv. 55 ff.) complains that Homer, though a "marvelous clerk" did not "live until one hundred years after the Trojan War" and commends the absolute truthfulness of Dares and Dictys, whose words he proposes to "follow to the letter;" a marginal note in a ms. of the *Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν* of the eleventh-century Georgius Cedrenus states (according to Allatius in Gronovius' *Thesaurus*, X, 1774) that Homer "wrote his *Iliad*" exactly "ninety-nine years after the Trojan War;" the twelfth-century historian Constantine Manasses (*Σύνοψις χρονική*, ed. Bekker, Niebuhr's *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, p. 23), while acknowledging that Homer made use of good documents, claims that he misrepresented facts; the sixth-century historian Joannes Malalas (*Χρονογραφία* ed. Dindorf, Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 132, ll. 20 ff.) and his excerptor, the twelfth-century historian Joannes Tzetzes (*Historiarum Variarum Chiliades*, ed. Kiessling, V, 29, 30), concur in the statement that it was Dictys to whom Homer and Virgil afterwards had recourse for the substance of their poems; the twelfth-century poet Joseph of Exeter (*Historia de Bello Trojano*, ed. in Valpy, *Scriptores Latini*, lib. I, vv. 24 ff.) and the thirteenth-century poet Albert of Stade (*Troilus*, ed. Merzdorf, lib. VI, vv. 697 ff.) rejoice that Dares the Phrygian soldier rejects all poetic fables and holds himself strictly

(I, 3), an event witnessed neither by himself nor his informants and yet of such immediate note to a patriotic Greek as to require no special authentication. Dares goes even farther and introduces such remote events as the landing of the Argonauts on the coast of Phrygia (II), the First Destruction of Troy by Hercules (III), and the Embassy of Antenor to regain Hesiona (V), which, though directly known neither to himself nor his informants, must, in like manner, have become matters of concern to every public-spirited Trojan.

within the bounds of truth; the twelfth-century historian Guido delle Colonne (*Historia Trojana*, Strasburg, 1486, sig. a 1 rect., col. 1, ll. 34 ff.) accuses Homer of having deliberately tampered with the plain unvarnished truth of Dares, and of having invented many incidents that never occurred and misrepresented others that did; Chaucer accords to Dares and Dictys a position in front of Homer on the iron pillar of his *Hous of Fame* (v.1467); and, finally, Sir Philip Sidney in a memorable passage in his *Apologie for Poetrie* (ed. Arber, p. 36) contrasts the "right Aeneas" of Dares Phrygius with the "fayned Aeneas" of Virgil.

In the second place, Dares and Dictys display their opposition to Homer by offering a rationalistic explanation of supernatural occurrences. In Dictys (VI, 7) the guests at the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis are no longer divinities but mortals, who from their skill in song are fancifully termed divine; Thetis herself is not a goddess but a mortal, the daughter of Chiron, who is no longer a centaur but a man; Hecuba (III, 26), when about to give birth to Paris, dreams not, as in ancient tradition,<sup>1</sup> of a fire-brand but of the burning of Mount Ida; the Golden Apple of Discord<sup>2</sup> (Dictys as here represented by his redactor Malalas, p. 92, l. 19)<sup>3</sup> has faded into a mere type or symbol of Victory; the Judgment of Paris (Dictys as again represented by Malalas,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Troad.* 922.

<sup>2</sup> Represented more especially in early Greek vase-painting.

<sup>3</sup> Malalas derived his Troica (which form the principal substance of the fifth book of his *Χρονολογία*) from Dictys, as is evident both from his repeated citations of that author and from the general agreement that exists between his version of the Trojan War and that found in the Latin Dictys. That it was, however, from the Greek Dictys (cf. p. 35, note 1), and not from the Latin Dictys translated by Septimius, that he drew his materials is rendered probable by his presumable inability to read Latin and certain by his presentation of certain particulars not found in the Latin text (cf. Noack, *Der griechische Dictys*, *Philologus*, Supplementband VI, 403 ff.; Griffin, op. cit., pp. 104 ff.).

92, 15-16) no longer takes the form of an actual experience<sup>1</sup> but is represented as forming the contents of a poem in which Paris upholds Venus as superior to the other goddesses. In Dares (VII) Paris does not decide between the three goddesses in reality, but only in a vision; the Wooden Horse of antiquity<sup>2</sup> has become degraded to the likeness of a horse's head painted on the Scaean gate. At other times Dictys, who departs less radically from Homer than Dares, produces perhaps an even more decidedly rationalistic impression by so far compromising with ancient tradition as to leave it uncertain (I, 19) whether the pestilence that invaded the Greek fleet at Aulis was due to the wrath of Diana or to the infection of the air by dead bodies and by giving the reader a choice (VI, 10) between three possible explanations of the sudden disappearance of Himera, first, that she was translated to heaven by her celestial mother, second, that she committed suicide, and, third, that she was slain by thieves.

This habit of rationalizing ancient myth recurs repeatedly in later medieval literature. Thus Malalas, in two passages that are not Dictaeon,<sup>3</sup> attributes to an otherwise unknown Phidalius of Corinth<sup>4</sup> the statements, first (117, 8 ff.), that Ulysses did not in reality put out the eye of Polyphemus, as Euripides had stated, but merely robbed him of his daughter Elpe, symbolically represented as the "light of his eye," and, secondly (120, 6 ff), that Circe did not as a matter of fact turn men into swine, as Homer had related, but merely

<sup>1</sup> As in the *Κύπρια* (ed. G. Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Lipsiae, 1877, p. 17).

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned in the *Ἰλιάς μικρά* (ed. Kinkel, op. cit., p. 37).

<sup>3</sup> Because attributed, not to Dictys, but to Phidalius of Corinth, By thus introducing rationalistic particulars from this second Trojan annalist Malalas exemplifies the continued fondness of later writers for representations of this sort.

<sup>4</sup> Nothing further than these two allusions to Phidalius of Corinth is known of an author whose name was, like that of Dictys, a pseudonym, but whose memoirs were, in all probability, still known to Malalas.

inspired them with bestial appetites. Albert of Stade (*Troilus*, lib. III, vv. 217 ff.) censures the extravagances of that most magnificent Homeric fiction of the cloud-born steeds of Dolon and Rhesus and commends the absolute truthfulness of Dares "qui praeter verum scriptitat nil;" and Guido delle Colonne, in a passage (op. cit., sig. a 1 rect. 1, 39 ff.) to which Chaucer alludes in his *Hous of Fame* (vv. 1744 ff.), denounces Homer for having represented "the gods as fighting with men."

In the third place, Dares and Dictys, as though in compensation for the loss of the supernatural machinery of the ancient epos, offer, in striking contrast to Homer, such crass bits of realism as might serve to pique the curiosity of the reader without impugning the credit of the historian. Such, for example, are the bizarre touches with which Dares and Dictys enliven their "portraits" or personal descriptions of the principal Greek and Trojan heroes and heroines. Thus, Helen, according to Dares (XII), has a shapely leg and beauty-spot; Aeneas possesses sparkling black eyes; Polyxena is afflicted with the feminine curse of large hands; and Briseis (XIII) glories in knit eyebrows (a conception of feminine loveliness for which Fürst in *Philologus* LXI, 74 ff. claims an Egyptian genesis). In like manner Dictys (as again represented by his redactor Malalas, 105, 4 ff.) pictures Diomedes as twenty-two years of age, Briseis as twenty-one, and Chryseis as nineteen; Paris as thirty-three when he stole Helen, Helen herself as twenty-six. In other portions of his history Dictys presents details of an even more grotesque character. Thus Chryses (II, 47) restores his daughter to Agamemnon because the Greeks have treated her so well; Menelaus (I, 4), when informed of the rape of Helen, is far less disturbed by the loss of his wife than by the perfidy of his kinswomen Aethra and Clymena, who had assisted in her escape; Achilles (II, 19), in order to retain Diomedea as well as Briseis, pleads that the two girls being of the same age and nature cannot well be separated; the lamentations of

the Trojans at the death of Hector (III, 16) create such a commotion that the very birds of the air fall to earth in multitudes.

The subsequent perpetuation, though in constantly varying form, of this fantastic element in Dares and Dictys is perhaps most aptly illustrated in the gradual deterioration which the character of the famous medieval heroine Cressida undergoes in passing from Benoît, who represents her as "faible," to Chaucer, who describes her as fickle, and, finally, to Shakespeare, who pictures her as wanton. Thus Benoît's Briseida (*Roman de Troie*, vv. 13416 ff.) "smiles out of one eye and weeps out of the other;" at her departure from Troilus tears separate the lips of the lovers and Briseida weeps so copiously that "you could wring water from her garments." Chaucer's Creseyde emerges as the full-fledged coquette who when first seen in the temple by Troilus

"leet falle

Hir look a lite aside, in swich manere,  
Ascaunces, 'What! may I not stonden here?'  
And after that hir loking gan she lighte,  
That nevere thoughte him seen so good a sighte" (I, 290 ff.).

And, finally, in Shakespeare (IV, 5, 55 ff.) it is the expressive countenance of the courtesan that evokes from Ulysses the exclamation:

"Fie, fie upon her!

There's language in her eye, her cheek, her lip,  
Nay, her foot speaks; her wanton spirit looks out  
At every joint and motive of her body."<sup>1</sup>

In the fourth place, Dares and Dictys turn the tables upon Homer by exalting the subordinate and degrading the principal Homeric passages. Thus the Cretan general Idomeneus, who plays a comparatively minor rôle in Homer, and the

<sup>1</sup>Quite in the spirit of the old traditions are, likewise, the words which Shakespeare's Pandarus applies to Troilus: "I think his smiling becomes him better than any man in all Phrygia" (I, 2, 135-6).

Greek leader Palamedes, nowhere mentioned by the Greek poet, receive in Dictys parts of no inconsiderable importance. Idomeneus (I, 19) is one of the heroes chosen to replace Agamemnon in command and is afterwards (V, 10) sent as ambassador to Troy to conduct secret negotiations with regard to the surrender of the city, while Palamedes not only figures as one of the ambassadors sent to Troy to recover Helen (I, 4) and (I, 9) as one of the leaders chosen to replace Agamemnon, but is also represented in the Latin Dictys (I, 6; II, 15; V, 15) as endowed with all sorts of virtues and in the Greek Dictys (Malalas, 103, 10 ff.; Cedrenus, *Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν*, ed. Bekker in Niebuhr, op. cit., Cedrenus, vol. I, p. 220, ll. 8 ff.) as the father of many useful inventions. In Dares Troilus, mentioned by Homer (*Il.*, ω, 257) merely as the young prince whose untimely death forms the subject of a lament by the aged Priam, becomes a leading champion of the Trojans and is expressly described (VII) as "no less valiant than his brother Hector." Conversely, Dares and Dictys take pains to slight heroes magnified by Homer. In Dictys (I, 19) Agamemnon, uniformly designated by Homer as "prince of men," is deprived of command for refusing to allow the sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia at Aulis; Achilles, the much-wronged hero of the *Iliad*, is represented as treacherous and deceitful; he stabs Hector in the back by night (III, 15); cruelly strangles Troilus, the bright hope of the Trojans (IV, 9); and basely offers to betray the Greeks to Priam in return for the hand of Polyzena (III, 25); Ulysses, everywhere upheld by Homer as a model of wisdom and justice, insidiously compasses the death of Palamedes by luring him into a pit, to seek hidden treasure, where he is stoned to death from above (II, 15). Both Dares (XLI) and Dictys (V, 1, 8) represent Antenor and Aeneas, who in Homer play honorable and patriotic rôles, as secretly delivering the city into the hands of the Greeks; while according to Dares it is they—and not, as in ancient tradition,<sup>1</sup> the Greek

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Ἰλιάς μικρά*, ed. Kinkel, op. cit., p. 43.

Sinon—who present by night the signal for the Greeks to enter Troy.

This practice of reversing the fortunes of Homeric characters finds fullest expression in the later story of Troilus and Cressida. Thus Benoît, the presumable author of this fable, has exalted the Homeric Troilus to the commanding position of hero and the Homeric slave Briseis to the even more commanding position of heroine.<sup>1</sup> To provide a contrast to the high-minded devotion of the former and a motive for the inconstancy of the latter, he has transformed the honest Homeric Diomedes into an arch-practitioner of seductive wiles. For father to Briseis he selects the Trojan soothsayer Calchas, mentioned by Dares (XV),<sup>2</sup> and so far contravenes Homeric practice as to lay the opening scene of his fable in the city of Troy. To the group thus envisaged Boccaccio has added the go-between Pandarus, who sustains no affiliation with the Homeric archer of that name (*Il.*, β, 824), and finally, Shakespeare has raised Thersites from his Homeric rôle of braggart (*Il.*, β, 212 ff.) to discharge the all important function of chorus.

Finally, Dares and Dictys display, in contrast to Homer, a decided partisan bias, the one in favor of the Trojans, the other in favor of the Greeks. Each historian, true to the party of his choice, spares no pains to defame his opponents and to present his own countrymen in the most favorable light. Ajax Telamon, who nowhere distinguishes himself in Dares, figures in Dictys (*passim*) as the bravest and most illustrious of the Greeks, and Palamedes, who in Dares

<sup>1</sup> It is not improbable that Benoît derived certain aspects of his character Briseida from the Homeric Chryseis as well. Thus he represents Briseida as the daughter of the Trojan soothsayer Calchas, just as Homer had represented Chryseis as the daughter of the Greek priest Chryses.

<sup>2</sup> Who had already transformed the Homeric soothsayer of that name into a Trojan.



(XXV) attempts to undermine the authority of Agamemnon, is by Dictys endowed with all sorts of virtues (I, 6; II, 15; V, 15); in particular, Idomeneus and Meriones—mentioned (XIV) only to be killed (XIX, XXXIII) by Dares—play in the history of their follower Dictys peculiarly honorable and conspicuous rôles (II, 19; III, 1, 18, 19; IV, 2; V, 10). The Trojans, on the other hand, are constantly vilified and maligned by Dictys. They are stigmatized with the standing epithet “barbarians” and represented as coming forth to battle “sine modo atque ordine” and “clamore ingenti ac dissono;” Priam’s sons are turbulent and treacherous (I, 7, 11; II, 8, 22, 35, 41 ff.); they provoke the Trojan allies to revolt (III, 1) and to offer the Greeks a proposal of friendship which is disdainfully rejected (III, 3). In Dares, on the contrary, the situation is exactly reversed. According to the latter it is the Greeks, not the Trojans, who are, in the first instance, responsible for the outbreak of the war; Paris carries off Helen because the Greeks had first carried off his aunt Hesiona (III, VII) and not, as in Dictys (III, 26), at the sole instigation of Venus; moreover Paris does not (X), as in Dictys (I, 3), abduct Helen from the house of Menelaus but only from the temple of Diana at Cythera and not without her full consent; in the war itself Paris is not, as in Dictys (II, 39) a coward; he kills Antilochus (XXIV) and wounds Menelaus (XXI), Palamedes (XXVIII), Achilles (XXXIV), and Ajax (XXXV); Troilus, introduced by Dictys only to be strangled by order of Achilles (IV, 9), distinguishes himself by slaying many Greeks (XXIX) and wounding Diomedes, Agamemnon (XXXI), and Achilles (XXXIII). The Greeks, on the other hand, though ultimately victorious, suffer (XLIV) heavier losses than the Trojans (886,000 vs. 676,000 men) and are compelled to sue for peace seven times, the Trojans but three times.

This marked devotion of Dares and Dictys to the interests of a special party accounts in no small measure for the relative sphere of influence which each author came to exert in

the Middle Ages. Dictys with his pronounced Greek sympathies became the natural spokesman of the East, where Greek influence prevailed. Here Dares remained unknown and the Byzantine chroniclers Malalas, John of Antioch, Isaac Porphyrogenitus, and Tzetzes derived their versions of the Trojan War from Dictys. Dares with his emphatic Trojan sympathies became the natural spokesman of the West, where, in emulation of the example of Rome, every nation claimed descent from the house of Priam. There, though Dictys was known, Dares was invariably accorded the preference. Thus Western writers either follow Dares to the practical exclusion of Dictys (as, for example, Joseph of Exeter, Albert of Stade, and the anonymous author of the *Trojumanna Saga*) or, as in the majority of cases, follow Dares as far as his narrative extends<sup>1</sup> and employ Dictys by way of supplement or continuation (as in the case of Benoît de Ste.-More,<sup>2</sup> his translators,<sup>3</sup> and the anonymous author of the conclusion of Konrad von Würzburg's *Trojanerkrieg*).<sup>4</sup>

A final word remains to be said with regard to the ultimate origin of the various manifestations of antipathy to Homer which have thus far been passed in review. Are Dares and

<sup>1</sup> Dares opens his history with a record of events prior to the Trojan War and ends with an account of the destruction of the city, whereas Dictys first begins with an account of Menelaus' absence in Crete and the rape of Helen and ends with the return of the Greeks. The two historians thus stand in a complementary relation to one another, their histories taken together covering the three-fold series of events which in later, Byzantine, times came to be comprehended within the Trojan cycle (cf. Tzetzes' *Antihomerica*, *Homerica*, and *Posthomerica*).

<sup>2</sup> Benoît abandons his earlier source Dares at v. 24329 and follows Dictys from that point to the end of his *Roman*.

<sup>3</sup> Herbort von Fritzlar, Konrad von Würzburg, and Guido delle Colonne, who, as translators of Benoît, naturally exhibit in their histories the same relation to Dares and Dictys as he.

<sup>4</sup> Who, instead of following the concluding or Dictæan portion of Benoît, has made direct use of Dictys (cf. Keitscher, *Die Fortsetzung zu Konrad von Würzburg's Trojanerkriege und ihr Verhältniss zum Original*, Breslau, 1871).

Dictys to be regarded as the actual authors of these anti-Homeric representations, or are they, no less than their medieval successors, to be looked upon as the mere perpetuators of a practice that had gained general currency before their day? That Dares and Dictys were not the originators of the practice in question but represent simply the culmination of a series of earlier representations of a similar character is made evident both by the survival of other Greek works that contain specifications precisely analogous to their own and by frequent reference in Greek literature to still further compositions, now lost, which either took, like them, the form of forgeries of alleged pre-Homeric authorship or else were written as direct personal attacks upon Homer by authors whose names alone have come down to us. Of extant works containing specifications analogous to those of Dares and Dictys the most noteworthy is the *Ἡρωικός* composed by Philostratus, a Greek writer of the third century A. D. In this work Protesilaus, who, though mentioned but twice by Homer (*Il.*, β, 698; ν, 681), figures as hero, is represented as returning to earth in the form of a shade to impart confidential communications to a certain vine-dresser of Elaus in order to vindicate himself and his fellows from the intentional neglect of Homer. In the course of his disclosures Protesilaus states that the wanderings of Ulysses were due—not, as Homer had represented, to his ill-treatment of Polyphemus—but to the hand he had taken in the death of Palamedes (*Her.*, ed. Olearius, p. 695), casts reflection upon the Homeric Paris as a warrior committed to the fastidious practice of paring his nails before battle (p. 725), and, in particular, prefers repeated charges against Homer for obliterating the distinction between divinities and mortals and representing the gods as fighting with men (pp. 692, 693, etc.).<sup>1</sup> To lost Antihomeric taking, like Dares and Dictys,

<sup>1</sup> The same rationalizing tendency appears also in the *Ὀμηρικὰ ζητήματα* of the Neoplatonist Porphyry (third century A. D.), which gives an

the form of forgeries purporting to be written by contemporaries of the Trojan War repeated reference is made by Byzantine authors of the Middle Ages. Thus, just as Dictys had represented himself as the follower and scribe of Idomeneus, so Malalas (132, 19 ff.) and Tzetzes (op. cit., v. 829 ff.) state that a certain Sisypheus accompanied the Salaminian Teucer to the Trojan War and served that prince in the capacity of amanuensis. Again, just as Dictys had composed his annals in Phœnician characters and at the instigation of his lord Idomeneus, so the eleventh century Suidas reports in his *Lexicon* (sub Κόρινθος) that a certain Corinnus the Ilian wrote, at the instigation of his master Palamedes, annals of the Trojan War in the Doric letters invented by that worthy. Still again, just as Dares and Dictys offer a rationalistic explanation of supernatural phenomena, so Malalas relates (cf. p. 42) that Phidalius of Corinth, who, to judge from the analogy of Dictys and Sisypheus, must likewise be regarded as a pre-Homeric annalist, inveighs against the ancient myths of Polyphemus and Circe; just as Dares and Dictys espouse the cause of heroes unduly neglected by Homer, so Suidas states in his *Lexicon* (sub Παλαμῆδης) that Palamedes wrote a poem on the Trojan War that was afterwards rejected from spite by Homer and Agamemnon's descendants; and just as Dictys had been represented by Malalas (cf. p. 40) as one of the chief sources of Homer and Virgil, so Ptolemaeus Chennus (*Καινὴ ἱστορία*, ed. from Photius, cod. 190, by Westermann, *Mythographi Graeci*, p. 194, ll. 10 ff.) relates that a certain Phantasia, daughter of Nicargus, king of Memphis, wrote an Iliad which was afterwards used by Homer. Finally Aelian (*Varia Historia*, XIV, 21) relates that a certain Syagrius was, after Or-

allegorical interpretation to Homeric myth, and in the *Ἱερὰ ἀναγραφὴ* of the romance writer Evemerus (fourth century B. C.), which reduces the gods and heroes of the ancient mythology to magnified images of men.

pheus and Musaeus, the first poet to sing of the Trojan War and Ptolemaeus Chennus in his *Καὴν ἱστορία* draws up a long list of Trojan annalists (quoted from Photius cod. 178 by Hercher, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, ed. Fleckeisen, Supplementband 1, 269), whose records had, doubtless, in most cases, no existence outside the brains of that author.<sup>1</sup> By reason of the frequency of these allusions to pre-Homeric forgeries, evidently of much the same stripe as Dares and Dictys, and of the fact that one of them, the Sisyphus forgery, still survives in part in the Dictys annals of Malalas,<sup>2</sup> there can be no doubt that Dares and Dictys are to be regarded as by no means the only members of their class but that there must have broken out, contemporaneously with them and perhaps as a result of the rhetorical activity of the Alexandrine sophists, a veritable epidemic of such productions, of which Dares and Dictys, as the most notable examples, have alone chanced to survive in independent form. Finally, that a third class of Antihomerica must have existed, which, like the second class, have, for the most part, not come down to us and which, to judge from the titles, must have taken, unlike the first and second classes, the form of direct personal attacks upon Homer, is rendered probable by the ascription of an *Ἀνθόμῆρος* in twenty-four books,<sup>3</sup> to Ptolemaeus Chennus, of the first century A. D., of diatribes against Homer to Zenophones of Colophon and to Zoilus (surnamed on that account *Ὀμηρομδοσιξ*),<sup>4</sup> and of a hymn in honor of Palamedes to the sophist

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hercher, op. cit., 269 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Haupt, *Philologus* XL, 107 ff.; Patzig, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* I, 131 ff.; Greif, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Dictys und Daresfrage*, pp. 9 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Christ, *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*, Müller's *Handbuch*, VII, 762.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Christ, op. cit., 64.

Gorgias,<sup>1</sup> the last three writers of the fifth century B. C. Whatever, therefore, may have been the ultimate origin of these various anti-Homeric representations of the Trojan War, whether their growth may have been furthered more particularly by sophists who set their pupils the task of composing histories of the Trojan War from new points of view—a theory that would seem to receive countenance from the words of Dion Chrysostomus, who in his eleventh oration speculates how the Trojan War would have turned out had there been any, and of Strabo, who (XII, p. 600) reproaches Hellanicus for having followed a tradition according to which Troy had never been destroyed,<sup>2</sup>—or by the increasingly sceptical tendencies of Greek philosophy—a theory that would seem to be borne out by the rationalistic treatment of Homeric myth in Evemerus and Porphyry—there can, at any rate, be no doubt that Dares and Dictys were not the originators, but merely the most successful practitioners of a fashion that existed long before their day.

NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Christ, *op. cit.*, 367.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., also, Stesichorus, who in his famous *Palinode* or recantation, relates that Helen had never been carried to Troy (cf. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 265).